

## REMARKS

Claims 25-37 and 52-65 remain in the present application. Claims 25 and 52 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on June 1, 2010 between Examiners Charles Hicks and Alexander Beck and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 1, 2010 that Witehira in view of Jiang does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements of "wherein an overlap of said first plurality of sub-pixels and said second plurality of sub-pixels is configured to reduce Moiré interference" as recited in independent Claim 25. It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 1, 2010 that Witehira in view of Huston does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements of "wherein said overlap is configured to reduce Moiré interference" as recited in independent Claim 52. Applicants thank the Examiners for conducting the interview.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

#### Claims 25-33 and 37

Claims 25-33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,906,762 to Witehira

et al. (referred to herein as “Witehira”) in view of United States Patent Number 6,573,961 to Jiang et al. (referred to herein as “Jiang”). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 1, 2010 that Witehira in view of Jiang does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “wherein an overlap of said first plurality of sub-pixels and said second plurality of sub-pixels is configured to reduce Moiré interference” as recited in independent Claim 25. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 25 is not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Jiang. Since Claims 26-33 and 37 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 26-33 and 37 are also not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Jiang. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-33 and 37 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

#### Claims 34-36

Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Jiang and further in view of United States Patent Number 7,072,095 to Liang et al. (referred to herein as “Liang ‘095”). Applicants respectfully submit that Liang ‘095, either alone or in combination with Witehira and/or Jiang, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “wherein an overlap of said first plurality of sub-pixels and said second plurality of sub-pixels is configured to reduce Moiré interference” as recited in independent Claim 25. Since Claims 34-36 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that

Claims 34-36 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Jiang and further in view of Liang '095. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 34-36 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

#### Claims 52-60

Claims 52-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0154102 to Huston (referred to herein as "Huston"). It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on June 1, 2010 that Witehira in view of Huston does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements of "wherein said overlap is configured to reduce Moiré interference" as recited in independent Claim 52. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 52 is not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Huston. Since Claims 53-60 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 53-60 are also not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Huston. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 52-60 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

#### Claim 61

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Liang '095. Applicants respectfully submit that Liang '095, either alone or in combination with Witehira and/or Huston, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements

of “wherein said overlap is configured to reduce Moiré interference” as recited in independent Claim 52. Since Claim 61 recites further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 52, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 61 is not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Liang ‘095. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 61 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, is allowable.

#### Claims 62 and 65

Claims 62 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Jiang. Applicants respectfully submit that Jiang, either alone or in combination with Witehira and/or Huston, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “wherein said overlap is configured to reduce Moiré interference” as recited in independent Claim 52. Since Claims 62 and 65 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 52, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 62 and 65 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Jiang. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 62 and 65 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

#### Claims 63 and 64

Claims 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Jiang and further yet in view of Liang ‘095. Since Claims 63 and 64 recite further elements

of the invention claimed in independent Claim 52, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 64 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Huston and further in view of Jiang and further yet in view of Liang '095. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 64 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

#### General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-37 and 52-65 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 7 / 29 / 2010

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060